8th November 1935]

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—"I do not quite understand the question. I may state generally that it is impossible for Government to give any exact figure of expenditure on the Cauvery delta for this reason that this system was constructed by the ancient Hindu Rajas long before Government took possession. What was spent then we do not know and it must only be a matter of conjecture."

*Progress of the scheme for the construction of a tank across the Kaveri Vagu, Nellore district.*

* 506 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the stage reached in the construction of a new tank across Kaveri Vagu in Gundimadakala village, Udayagiri taluk, Nellore district?

*A.*—Plans and estimates have been received by Government. The scheme is being considered in connexion with the next year's budget.

*Representations for diversion of water into the Badathalav tank, Salem district.*

* 507 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether representations have been received from the pattadars under the Badathalav tank ayacut in Krishnagiri taluk of Salem district in or about July last either by the Government or by the District Collector or any of the local officials praying for the diversion of water from the Markandeya river, or from the jungle stream in Narlapalli reserve forest through Chakanayur tank, to the said Badathalav tank to provide adequate supply for irrigation; and

(*b*) if so, what action has been taken thereon and what the Government propose to do with the schemes suggested?

*A.*—(*a*) & (*b*) A petition, dated 20th July 1935, was received by Government and forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. The scheme for the diversion of water from the Markandeya river was abandoned in 1926 on financial grounds. The Chief Engineer (Irrigation) will submit a report on the other scheme if he considers it feasible.

## Land Revenue Administration

*Penalty for raising fodder crops in the delta taluks of the Nellore district.*

* 508 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to the answer to the supplementary question to question No. 108 answered on 7th August 1935—

(*a*) whether the Government have received the report which they undertook to call for from the Collector of Nellore; and

[8th November 1935

(b) if so, whether they will be pleased to lay it on the table of the House?

A.—A copy [a] of a report, dated 16th October 1935, received from the Collector of Nellore is attached.

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"May I know if it is a fact, Sir, that the fodder crops are grown before the harvest actually commences in the wet land area and they won't require any further water? Is it a fact that on the moisture itself they can grow pillipesara?"

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—"What the hon. Member says may be true, I do not know. But in this case, the Collector reports that water was taken for pillipesara, and it seriously jeopardized the standing food crops."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Is it a fact, Sir, that in February the Collector of Nellore had notified that there was scarcity of water for second crop?"

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—"I have no information."

*Distraint proceedings in Kasaragod taluk for arrears of land revenue.*

* 508-A *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what the total amount of land revenue in arrears in the Kasaragod taluk is;

(b) what the total number is of distraint warrants and sale notices issued in the Kasaragod taluk;

(c) whether there is any distinction in classification between the districts of Malabar and South Kanara with regard to pepper gardens and waste lands in the matter of taxation; if so, what the distinction is;

(d) whether it is a fact that it is this classification which is responsible for the arrears of land revenue in Kasaragod to such an extent; and

(e) whether the Government have considered or propose to consider a reclassification of these areas with a view to bringing them in line with those prevailing in Malabar?

*A.*—(a) & (b) The Government have no information.

(c) The pepper vine is counted as a garden product in South Kanara, but not in Malabar. In South Kanara assessment is charged on all lands included in holdings. In Malabar no assessment is charged on an occupied dry land included in a holding unless the land is cultivated or brought under cultivation.

(d) The Government see no reason to suppose that it is a fact.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on page 951 infra.